arXiv:quant-ph/0512098v1 13 Dec 2005

Can the Quantum Measurement Problem be resolved within the framework of Schroedinger Dynamics?*

by Geoffrey Sewell**

Department of Physics, Queen Mary, University of London

Mile End Road, London E1 4NS, UK

To the Memory of John Lewis

Abstract

We formulate the dynamics of the generic quantum system S_c comprising a microsystem S and a macroscopic measuring instrument $\mathcal{I}$, whose pointer positions are represented by orthogonal subspaces of the Hilbert space of its pure states. These subspaces are the simultaneous eigenspaces of a set of coarse grained intercommuting macroscopic observables and, most crucially, their dimensionalities are astronomically large, increasing exponentially with the number, N, of particles comprising $\mathcal{I}$. We formulate conditions under which the conservative dynamics of S_c yields both a reduction of the wave packet describing the state of S and a one-to-one correspondence, following a measurement, between the pointer position of $\mathcal{I}$ and the resultant eigenstate of S; and we show that these conditions are fulfilled, up to utterly negligible corrections that decrease exponentially with N, by the *finite* version of the Coleman-Hepp model.

* Lecture given at the J. T. Lewis Memorial Conference, held in Dublin, June 14-17, 2005

** e-mail: g.l.sewell@qmul.ac.uk

1. Introductory Discussion.

In Von Neumann's [1] phenomenological picture of the measurement process, the coupling of a microsystem, S, to a measuring instrument, $\mathcal{I}$, leads to the following two essential effects.

(I) It converts a pure state of S, as given by a linear combination $\sum_{r=1}^{n} c_r u_r$ of its orthonormal energy eigenstates u_r, into a statistical mixture of these states for which $|c_r|^2$ is the probability of finding this system in the state u_r. This effect is often termed the 'reduction of the wave packet'.

(II) It sends a certain set of classical, i.e. intercommuting, macroscopic variables M of $\mathcal{I}$ to values, indicated by pointers, that specify which of the states u_r of S is actually realised.

This leaves us with the following question, which is the basic problem of the quantum theory of measurement.

$\mathcal{Q}$ *Can the standard quantum dynamics of the conservative composite S_c, allied to a suitable choice of the macroscopic observables M, lead, in principle, to the effects (I) and (II)?*

This is the question that we shall address here. Evidently it is crucially pertinent to that of the completeness of quantum mechanics, and while some authors (e. g. [2-4]) have argued in favour of an affirmative answer to it, others have taken quite different views. For example, Von Neumann [1] and Wigner [5] have proposed that the observation of the pointer of $\mathcal{I}$ requires another measuring instrument, $\mathcal{I}_2$, which in turn requires yet another instrument, and so on, in such a way that the whole process involves an infinite regression ending up in the observer's brain (!), while others have taken the view that the measurement problem cannot be resolved without modification of the Schroedinger dynamics of S_c, due to *either* its interaction with the 'rest of the Universe' [6-9] *or* a certain postulated nonlinearity that leads to a classical deterministic evolution of its macroscopic observables [10].

As regards the main requirements of a satisfactory treatment of the question $\mathcal{Q}$, it is clear from the works of Bohr [11], Jauch [12] and Van Kampen [3] that such a theory demands both a characterisation of the macroscopicality of the observables M and an amplification property of the $S-\mathcal{I}$ coupling whereby different microstates of S give rise to macroscopically different states of $\mathcal{I}$. Evidently, this implies that the initial state in which $\mathcal{I}$ is prepared must be unstable against microscopic changes in the state of S. On the other hand, as emphasised by Whitten-Wolfe and Emch [13, 14], the correspondence between the microstate of S and the eventual observed macrostate of $\mathcal{I}$ must be stable against macroscopically small changes in the initial state of this instrument, of the kind that are inevitable in experimental procedures. Thus, the initial state of $\mathcal{I}$ must be *metastable* by virtue of this combination of stability and instability properties (cf. Refs. [3, 4, 12]).

Rigorous constructive treatments of the measurement process, which take account of the above considerations, have been provided by Hepp [15] and Whitten-Wolfe and Emch [13, 14] on the basis of models for which $\mathcal{I}$ is idealised as an infinite system, i.e. as an infinitely extended system of particles, with finite number density. In this idealisation, the

macroscopic observables M are taken to be a set of global intensive ones, which necessarily intercommute. This resultant picture of $\mathcal{I}$ and its macroscopic observables corresponds to that employed for the statistical mechanical description of large systems in the thermodynamic limit [16-18], and it has the merit of sharply distinguishing between macroscopically different states, since different values of M correspond to disjoint primary representations of the observables. Moreover, in the treatments of the measurement problem based on this picture, the models of Hepp [15] and Whitten-Wolfe and Emch [13, 14] do indeed exhibit the required reduction of the wave-packet and the one-to-one correspondence between the pointer position of $\mathcal{I}$ and the resultant state of S; and these results are stable against all localised perturbations of the initial state of $\mathcal{I}$. On the debit side, however, Hepp's model requires an infinite time for the measurement to be effected (cf. Bell [19]), while although that of Whitten-Wolfe and Emch achieves its measurements in finite times, it does so only by dint of a physically unnatural, globally extended $S - \mathcal{I}$ interaction.

These observations motivate us to explore the mathematical structure of the measuring process on the basis of the model for which $\mathcal{I}$ is a large but finite N-particle system, with the aim of obtaining conditions under which it yields the essential results obtained for the infinite model instrument, but with a finite realistic observational time. In fact, we have achieved this aim in a recent article [20], in which we showed that the quantum mechanics of finite conservative systems does indeed contain the structures required for an affirmative answer to the question $\mathcal{Q}$, as illustrated by an explicit treatment of the finite version of the Coleman-Hepp model [15]. This result provides rigorous mathematical substantiation of the arguments of Refs. [2-4] which led to the same main conclusion. A key feature of our treatment [20] was the representation of the macro-observables M and the pointer positions of $\mathcal{I}$ within the framework proposed by Van Kampen [21] and Emch [22], whereby M comprises a set of coarse- grained intercommuting extensive observables and the pointer positions of $\mathcal{I}$ correspond to their simultaneous (mutually orthogonal) eigenspaces, which play the role of classical phase cells. Most importantly, these cells are of astronomically large dimensionalities, which increase exponentially with N, and in the ensuing theory they play the role analogous to that of the irreducible representation spaces of the infinite systems of Refs. [13-15]. As a result, the finite system model yields the essential positive results of the infinite one, and moreover leads to a realisation of the measurement process within a finite, realistic time. To be precise, this model exhibits the properties (I) and (II) up to corrections that decrease exponentially with N and that are therefore utterly negligible by any standards of experimental physics.

The object of the present note is to describe the essential features of our treatment that has led to these results. We start in Section 2 by constructing the generic model of S_c and formulating both the time-dependent expectation values of the observables of S and their conditional expectation values, given the values of the macro-observables M of $\mathcal{I}$, subject to the assumption that S and $\mathcal{I}$ are independently prepared and then coupled together at time $t = 0$. In Section 3, we formulate the conditions on the dynamics of the model and the structure of the macro- observables M under which it exhibits the essential properties (I) and (II) of a measurement process. In Section 4, we show that these conditions are fulfilled the finite version of the Coleman-Hepp model [15]. We conclude, in Section 5,

with a brief resume of the picture presented here.

2. The Generic Model.

We assume that the algebras of bounded observables of the microsystem S, the instrument $\mathcal{I}$ and their composite $S_c = (S + \mathcal{I})$ are those of the bounded operators in separable Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{K}$, respectively. Correspondingly, the states of these systems are represented by the density matrices in the respective spaces. The density matrices for the pure states are then the projection operators $P(f)$ of their normalised vectors f. For simplicity we assume that $\mathcal{H}$ is of finite dimensionality n.

We assume that the macroscopic description of $\mathcal{I}$ pertinent to the measuring process is based on a chosen abelian subalgebra $\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathcal{B}$, which is generated by coarse-grained macroscopic observables (cf. [21, 22]): these are typically extensive variables of parts or the whole of $\mathcal{I}$. The choice of $\mathcal{M}$ yields a partition of $\mathcal{K}$ into the simultaneous eigenspaces $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$ of its elements. The subspaces $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$ of $\mathcal{K}$ correspond to classical 'phase cells', which we take to represent the macrostates of $\mathcal{I}$ and to be unequivocally indicated by the 'pointer positions' of this instrument. Most importantly, the dimensionality of each of these cells is astronomically large, since it is given essentially by the exponential of the entropy function of the macro-observables and thus grows exponentially with N. The largeness of the phase cells is closely connected to the robustness of the macroscopic measurement.

Since $\mathcal{I}$ is designed so that the pointer readings are in one-to-one correspondence with the eigenstates $u_1, .\,., u_n$ of S, we assume that the index α of its macrostates also runs from 1 to n. Hence, denoting the projection operator for $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$ by Π_α, it follows from the above specifications that

$$\Pi_\alpha \Pi_\beta = \Pi_\alpha \delta_{\alpha\beta}, \tag{2.1}$$

$$\sum\nolimits_{\alpha=1}^{n} \Pi_\alpha = I_{\mathcal{K}} \tag{2.2}$$

and that each element M of $\mathcal{M}$ takes the form

$$M = \sum\nolimits_{\alpha=1}^{n} M_\alpha \Pi_\alpha, \tag{2.3}$$

where the M_α's are scalars.

We assume that S_c is a conservative system, whose Hamiltonian operator H_c, in $\mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{K}$, takes the form

$$H_c = H\otimes I_{\mathcal{K}} + I_{\mathcal{H}}\otimes K + V, \tag{2.4}$$

where H and K are the Hamiltonians of S and $\mathcal{I}$, respectively, and V is the $S - \mathcal{I}$ interaction. Further, we assume that $\mathcal{I}$ is an instrument of the first kind [12], in that the interaction V induces no transitions between the eigenstates of H. Thus, since the latter comprise an orthogonal basis set $(u_1, .\,., u_n)$ of $\mathcal{H}$, with energy levels $(\epsilon_1, .\,., \epsilon_n)$, respectively, the operators H and V take the forms $\sum_{r=1}^{n} \epsilon_r P(u_r)$ and $\sum_{r=1}^{n} P(u_r)\otimes V_r$, respectively, where the V_r's are self-adjoint operators in $\mathcal{K}$. Hence, by Eq. (2.4), H_c reduces to the form

$$H_c = \sum\nolimits_{r=1}^{n} P(u_r)\otimes K_r, \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$K_r = K + V_r + \epsilon_r I_{\mathcal{K}}. \tag{2.6}$$

Hence the one-parameter unitary group $\{U_c(t) = \exp(iH_c t) | t \in \mathbf{R}\}$, which governs the dynamics of S_c, is given by the formula

$$U_c(t) = \sum\nolimits_{r=1}^{n} P(u_r) \otimes U_r(t), \tag{2.7}$$

where

$$U_r(t) = \exp(iK_r t). \tag{2.8}$$

We assume that the the systems S and $\mathcal{I}$ are prepared, independently of one another, in initial states represented by density matrices ω and Ω, respectively, and then coupled together at time $t = 0$. Thus the initial state of the composite S_c is given by the density matrix $\omega \otimes \Omega$ in $\mathcal{H}_c := \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}$. Further, we assume that the initial state of S is pure, and thus that ω is the projection operator $P(\psi)$ for a vector ψ in $\mathcal{H}$. The initial state of S_c is then

$$\Phi = P(\psi) \otimes \Omega. \tag{2.9}$$

Further, ψ is a linear combination of the basis vectors $(u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ and hence takes the form

$$\psi = \sum\nolimits_{r=1}^{n} c_r u_r, \tag{2.10}$$

where

$$\sum\nolimits_{r=1}^{n} |c_r|^2 = 1. \tag{2.11}$$

Since the evolute at time t (≥ 0) of the initial state Φ of S_c is $U_c^\star(t) \Phi U_c(t) := \Phi(t)$, it follows from Eqs. (2.7), (2.9) and (2.10) that

$$\Phi(t) = \sum\nolimits_{r,s=1}^{n} \overline{c}_r c_s P_{r,s} \otimes \Omega_{r,s}(t), \tag{2.12}$$

where $P_{r,s}$ is the operator in $\mathcal{H}$ defined by the equation

$$P_{r,s} f = (u_s, f) u_r \ \forall \ f \in \mathcal{H} \tag{2.13}$$

and

$$\Omega_{r,s}(t) = U_r^\star(t) \Omega U_s(t). \tag{2.14}$$

Expectation and Conditional Expectation Values of Observables. The observables of S_c with which we shall be concerned are just the self-adjoint elements of $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{M}$. Their expectation values for the time-dependent state $\Phi(t)$ are given by the formula

$$E\big(A \otimes M\big) = \mathrm{Tr}\big(\Phi(t)[A \otimes M]\big) \ \forall \ A \in \mathcal{A}, \ M \in \mathcal{M}. \tag{2.15}$$

In particular, the expectation values of the observables of S are given by the equation

$$E(A) = E(A \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}}) \ \forall A \in \mathcal{A}, \tag{2.16}$$

while the probability that the macrostate of $\mathcal{I}$ corresponds to the cell $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$ is

$$w_\alpha = E(I_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \Pi_\alpha). \tag{2.17}$$

Further, in view of the abelian property of the algebra $\mathcal{M}$, the functional E induces a conditional expectation $E(.|\mathcal{K}_\alpha)$ on $\mathcal{A}$, given the macrostate $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$, according to the following prescription. Since, by Eq. (2.3), M_α is the (sharply defined) value of the observable M for this macrostate, any such conditional expectation functional, compatible with E, is a positive normalised linear functional on $\mathcal{A}$ that satisfies the condition

$$E(A \otimes M) = \sum\nolimits_{\alpha=1}^{n} E(A|\mathcal{K}_\alpha) M_\alpha w_\alpha, \ \forall \ A \in \mathcal{A}, \ M \in \mathcal{M}. \tag{2.18}$$

Consequently, since Eqs. (2.3) and (2.15) imply that

$$E(A \otimes M) = \sum\nolimits_{\alpha=1}^{n} E(A \otimes \Pi_\alpha) M_\alpha, \ \forall \ A \in \mathcal{A}, \ M \in \mathcal{M},$$

the only admissible form for $E(.|\mathcal{K}_\alpha)$ is given by the formula

$$E(A|\mathcal{K}_\alpha) = E(A \otimes \Pi_\alpha)/w_\alpha \ \forall \ A \in \mathcal{A}, \ w_\alpha \neq 0. \tag{2.19}$$

It follows immediately from this equation that the positivity, linearity and normalisation properties of $E(.|\mathcal{K}_\alpha)$ ensue from those of E.

3 The Measurement Process

Suppose now that a reading of the pointer of $\mathcal{I}$ is made at time t. Then, according to the standard probabilistic interpretation of quantum mechanics, it follows from the above specifications that

(i) $E(A)$ is the expectation value of the observable A of S immediately before the reading;

(ii) w_α is the probability that the reading yields the result that the macrostate of $\mathcal{I}$ corresponds to the cell $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$; and,

(iii) in that case, $E(A|\mathcal{K}_\alpha)$ is the expectation value of A immediately after the measurement.

Thus, the measurement process is governed by the forms of the functionals E and $E(.|\mathcal{K}_\alpha)$ on the algebra $\mathcal{A}$. Further, defining

$$F_{r,s:\alpha} = Tr\big(\Omega_{r,s}(t)\Pi_\alpha\big) \ \forall \ r, s, \alpha \in \{1, . \ ., n\}, \tag{3.1}$$

it follows from Eqs. (2.2), (2.12)-(2,14), (2.16), (2.19) and (3.1) that these functionals are determined by the form of F according to the equations

$$E(A) = \sum\nolimits_{r=1}^{n} |c_r|^2 (u_r, Au_r) + \sum\nolimits_{r \neq s; r,s=1}^{n} \sum\nolimits_{\alpha=1}^{n} F_{r,s:\alpha} \overline{c}_r c_s (u_r, Au_s) \ \forall \ A \in \mathcal{A} \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$E(A|\mathcal{K}_\alpha) = \sum\nolimits_{r,s=1}^{n} F_{r,s;\alpha}\overline{c}_r c_s(u_r, Au_s)/w_\alpha \ \forall\ A{\in}\mathcal{A},\ w_\alpha{\neq}0. \tag{3.3}$$

Key properties of F that follow from Eqns. (2.2), (2.14) and (3.1) are that

$$\sum\nolimits_{\alpha=1}^{n} F_{r,r:\alpha} = 1, \tag{3.4}$$

$$1{\geq}F_{r,r:\alpha}{\geq}0, \tag{3.5}$$

$$F_{r,s:\alpha} = \overline{F}_{s,r:\alpha}, \tag{3.6}$$

and that, for $z_1, .\,., z_n{\in}\mathbf{C}$, the sesquilinear form $\sum_{r,s=1}^{n}\overline{z}_r z_s F_{r,s;\alpha}$ is positive. Hence

$$F_{r,r;\alpha}F_{s,s;\alpha}{\geq}|F_{r,s;\alpha}|^2. \tag{3.7}$$

The Ideal Instruments. We term the instrument $\mathcal{I}$ *ideal* if there is a one-to-one correspondence between the pointer reading α and the eigenstate u_r of S, on a realistic observational time scale. Thus $\mathcal{I}$ is ideal if, for times t greater than some critical value, τ, and less, in order of magnitude, than the Poincare recurrence times,

(I.1) the time-dependent state $\Omega_{r,r}(t)$ of $\mathcal{I}$, that arises in conjunction with the state u_r of S in the formula (2.14), lies in one of the subspaces $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$;

(I.2) the correspondence between r and α here is one-to-one, i.e. $\alpha = a(r)$, where a is an invertible transformation a of the point set $\{1, .\,., n\}$; and

(I.3) this correspondence is stable with respect to perturbations of the initial state Ω of $\mathcal{I}$ that are localised, in the sense that each of them leaves this state unchanged outside some region contained in a ball of volume $O(1)$ with respect to N.

The conditions (I.1) and (I.2) signify that, for times t in the range specified there,

$$\mathrm{Tr}\big(\Omega_{r,r}(t)\Pi_\alpha\big) = \delta_{a(r),\alpha},$$

i.e., by Eq. (3.1),

$$F_{r,r:\alpha} = \delta_{a(r),\alpha}. \tag{3.8}$$

Further, by Eqs. (3.4) and (3.5) and the invertibility of the function a, Eq. (3.8) is equivalent to the condition

$$F_{r,r;a(r)} = 1. \qquad (3.8)',$$

while, by Eqs. (3.7) and (3.8) and the invertibility of a,

$$F_{r,s;\alpha} = 0 \text{ for } r{\neq}s. \tag{3.9}$$

Hence, by Eqs. (3.2) and (3.9),

$$E(A) = \sum\nolimits_{r=1}^{n} |c_r|^2(u_r, Au_r), \tag{3.10}$$

which signifies that, *immediately before* the pointer reading, S is in the mixed state represented by the density matrix

$$\rho = \sum\nolimits_{r=1}^{n} |c_r|^2 P(u_r). \tag{3.11}$$

Thus we have a reduction of the wave packet, as given by the transition from the pure state ψ $(= \sum_{r=1}^{n} c_r u_r)$ to this mixed state ρ.

Moreover, since $E(I_{\mathcal{H}}|\mathcal{K}_\alpha)\equiv 1$, it follows from Eqs. (3.3), (3.8) and (3.9) that

$$w_{a(r)} \equiv w_{a(r)} E(I_{\mathcal{H}}|\mathcal{K}_{a(r)}) = |c_r|^2 \tag{3.12}$$

and

$$E(A|\mathcal{K}_{a(r)}) = (u_r, Au_r). \tag{3.13}$$

Thus, in view of the definition (2.17) of w_α, Eq. (3.12) signifies that $|c_r|^2$ is the probability that the pointer reading of $\mathcal{I}$ corresponds to the macrostate represented by the cell $\mathcal{K}_{a(r)}$, while Eq. (3.13) signifies that the state of S *immediately after* this reading is the pure vectorial one u_r. Thus the property (3.8) implies both the reduction of the wave packet of S and the one-to-one correspondence between the pointer position of $\mathcal{I}$ and the resultant state of S.

Normal Measuring Instruments. We term the instrument $\mathcal{I}$ *normal* if the following conditions are fulfilled.

(N.1) A weaker form of the ideality condition (3.8), or equivalently (3.8)$'$, prevails, to the effect that the difference between the two sides of the latter formula is negligibly small, i.e., noting Eq. (3.4), that

$$0 < 1 - F_{r,r;a(r)} < \eta(N), \tag{3.14}$$

where, for large N, $\eta(N)$ is miniscule by comparison with unity: in the case of the finite version of the Coleman-Hepp model treated in Section 4, it is $\exp(-cN)$, where c is a fixed positive constant of the order of unity. We note that, by Eq. (3.4) and the positivity of Π_α, the condition (3.14) is equivalent to the inequality

$$0 < \sum\nolimits_{r \neq a^{-1}(\alpha)} F_{r,r;\alpha} < \eta(N). \tag{3.14$'$}$$

Further, it follows from Eqs. (3.7), (3.14) and (3.14)$'$ that

$$|F_{r,s;\alpha}| < \eta(N)^{1/2} \text{ for } r \neq s. \tag{3.15}$$

(N.2) This condition (N.1) is stable under localised modifications of the initial state Ω of $\mathcal{I}$. This stability condition may even be strengthened to include global perturbations of Ω corresponding to small changes in its intensive thermodynamic parameters (cf. the treatment of the Coleman-Hepp model in Section 4).

It follows now from Eqs. (3.2), (3.3) and (3.15) that the replacement of the ideal condition (3.8) by the normal one (3.14) leads to modifications of the order $\eta(N)^{1/2}$ to the

formulae (3.10) and (3.13). In particular, it implies that a pointer reading α signifies that it is overwhelmingly probable, but not absolutely certain, that the state of S is $u_{a^{-1}(\alpha)}$, as the following argument shows. Suppose that the initial state of S is u_r. Then, by Eq. (2.12), the state of S_c at time t is $P(u_r)\otimes\Omega_{r,r}(t)$ and consequently, by Eqs.(3.1) and (3.14)$'$, there is a probability of the order of $\eta(N)$ that the pointer reading is given by a value α, different from $a(r)$, of the indicator parameter of $\mathcal{I}$. In the freak case that this possibility is realised, this would mean that the state u_r of S led to a pointer reading $\alpha\neq a(r)$. Hence, in this case, any inference to the effect that a pointer reading α signified that the state of S was $u_{a^{-1}(\alpha)}$ would be invalid.

Comment. The distinction between ideal and normal instruments is essentially mathematical rather than observational, since for an instrument of the latter kind, the odds against the pointer indicating a 'wrong' microstate of S are overwhelming.

4. The Finite Coleman-Hepp Model.

This model is a caricature of an electron that interacts with a finite spin chain that serves to measure the electronic spin [15]. In order to fit this model into the scheme of the previous Sections, we regard the electron, $\mathcal{P}$, as the composite of its spin, $\mathcal{P}_1$, and its orbital component, $\mathcal{P}_2$. We then take the system S to be just $\mathcal{P}_1$ and the instrument $\mathcal{I}$ to be the composite of $\mathcal{P}_2$ and the chain $\mathcal{C}$. Thus, we build the model of $S_c = (S+\mathcal{I})$ from its components in the following way.

The System $S = \mathcal{P}_1$. This is just a single Pauli spin. Thus, its state space is $\mathcal{H} = \mathbf{C}^2$ and its three-component spin observable is given by the Pauli matrices (s_x, s_y, s_z). We denote by $u_\pm$ the eigenvectors of s_z whose eigenvalues are ± 1, respectively. These vectors then form a basis in $\mathcal{H}$. We denote their projection operators by $P_\pm$, respectively.

The System $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{P}_2+\mathcal{C})$. We assume that $\mathcal{P}$ moves along, or parallel to, the axis Ox and thus that the state space of $\mathcal{P}_2$ is $\tilde{\mathcal{K}} := L^2(\mathbf{R})$. We assume that $\mathcal{C}$ is a chain of Pauli spins located at the sites $(1, 2, .., 2L+1)$, of Ox, where L is a positive integer. Thus, the state space of $\mathcal{C}$ is $\hat{\mathcal{K}} := (\mathbf{C}^2)^{(2L+1)}$, and therefore that of $\mathcal{I}$ is $\mathcal{K} = \tilde{\mathcal{K}}\otimes\hat{\mathcal{K}}$.

The spin at the site n of $\mathcal{C}$ is represented by Pauli matrices $(\sigma_{n,x}, \sigma_{n,y}, \sigma_{n,z})$ that act on the n'th $\mathbf{C}^2$ component of $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$. Thus, they may be canonically identified with operators in $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ that satisfy the standard Pauli relations

$$\sigma_{n,x}^2 = \sigma_{n,y}^2 = \sigma_{n,z}^2 = \hat{I};\ \sigma_{n,x}\sigma_{n,y} = i\sigma_{n,z},\ \text{etc}, \tag{4.1}$$

together with the condition that the spins at different sites intercommute.

We assume that $\mathcal{P}_1$, $\mathcal{P}_2$ and $\mathcal{C}$ are independently prepared before being coupled together at time $t = 0$. Further, we assume that the initial states of $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ are pure ones, represented by vectors ψ and ϕ in $\mathcal{H}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$, respectively, while that of $\mathcal{C}$ is given by a density matrix $\hat{\Omega}$, in $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$.Thus, the initial state of $\mathcal{I}$ is

$$\Omega = P(\phi)\otimes\hat{\Omega}, \tag{4.2}$$

where $P(\phi)$ is the projection operator for ϕ. We assume that ϕ has support in a finite interval $[c, d]$ and that $\hat{\Omega}$ takes the form

$$\hat{\Omega} = \otimes_{n=1}^{2L+1} \hat{\omega}_n, \tag{4.3}$$

where $\hat{\omega}_n$, the initial state of the n'th spin of $\mathcal{C}$, is give by the formula

$$\hat{\omega}_n = \frac{1}{2}(I_n + m\sigma_{n,z}), \tag{4.4}$$

where $0 < m \leq 1$. Thus, asuming that there are no interactions between the spins of $\mathcal{C}$, $\hat{\Omega}$ is the equilibrium state obtained by subjecting this chain to a certain temperature-dependent magnetic field, directed along Oz. m is then the magnitude of the resultant polarisation of this chain. One sees immediately from Eqs. (4.3) and (4.4) that $\hat{\Omega}$ is a pure state if $m = 1$: otherwise it is mixed.

The Dynamics. Following Hepp [15], we assume that the Hamiltonian for the composite system S_c is

$$H_C = I_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes p \otimes I_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}} + P_- \otimes \sum\nolimits_{n=1}^{2L+1} V(x-n) \otimes \sigma_{n,x}, \tag{4.5}$$

where p and $V(x-n)$ are the differential and multiplicative operators in $L^2(\mathbf{R})$ $(= \tilde{\mathcal{K}})$ that transform $f(x)$ to $-i\hbar df(x)/dx$ and $V(x-n)f(x)$, respectively, and V is a bounded, real valued function on $\mathbf{R}$ with support in a finite interval $[a, b]$. Thus, in the notation of Eq. (2.6), but with r taking just the values $\pm$,

$$K_+ = p \otimes I_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}} \text{ and } K_- = p \otimes I_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}} + \sum\nolimits_{n=1}^{2L+1} V(x-n) \otimes \sigma_{n,x}. \tag{4.6}$$

The assumption here that the Hamiltonian for the free motion of $\mathcal{P}$ is linear rather than quadratic in p serves to simplify the model by avoiding dispersion of the 'electronic wave packet' .

The unitary groups $U_\pm$ generated by $iK_\pm$ are given by the formula

$$U_\pm(t) = \exp(iK_\pm t) \tag{4.7}$$

and the evolutes of Ω due to the actions of $U_\pm(t)$ are

$$\Omega_\pm(t) := U_\pm^\star(t) \Omega U_\pm(t). \tag{4.8}$$

These states are evidently the versions, for this model, of $\Omega_{r,r}(t)$, as defined by Eq. (2.14), with the double suffix (r, r) represented by $+$ or $-$. It follows now from Eqs. (4.2) and (4.6)-(4.8) that

$$\Omega_+(t) = P(\phi_t) \otimes \hat{\Omega}, \tag{4.9}$$

where

$$\phi_t(x) = \phi(x+t). \tag{4.10}$$

As for Ω_- it is convenient to formulate its evolution in interaction representation, in terms of the unitary operator

$$W(t) := U_-(t)\exp(-i[p\otimes I_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}}]t). \tag{4.11}$$

Thus, by Eqs. (4.2), (4.8) and (4.11),

$$\Omega_-(t) = \exp(-i[p\otimes I_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}}]t)\big(W^\star(t)[P(\phi)\otimes\hat{\Omega}]W(t)\big)\exp(i[p\otimes I_{\hat{\mathcal{K}}}]t). \tag{4.12}$$

By Eqs. (4.6), (4.7) and (4.11), $W(t)$ satisfies the Dyson integral equation

$$W(t) = I_{\mathcal{K}} + i\int_0^t ds\sum\nolimits_{n=1}^{2L+1}[V(x+s-n)\otimes\sigma_{n,x}]W(s),$$

whose solution is

$$W(t) = \exp\big(i\sum\nolimits_{n=1}^{2L+1}[F_{n,t}(x)\otimes\sigma_{n,x}]\big), \tag{4.13}$$

where

$$F_{n,t}(x) = \int_0^t dsV(x+s-n). \tag{4.14}$$

Further, since the supports of V and ϕ are $[a,b]$ and $[c,d]$, respectively, it follows from these last two equations that we may replace $F_{n,t}(x)$ by $\int_{\mathbf{R}} dxV(x)$ when employing Eq. (4.13) in the formula (4.12), provided that

$$d\leq a+1 \text{ and } t\geq\tau := 2L+1-b-c. \tag{4.15}$$

Thus, in this case, $W(t)$ may be replaced there by $I_{\tilde{\mathcal{K}}}\otimes Z$, where

$$Z = \exp(iJ\sum\nolimits_{n=1}^{2L+1}\sigma_{n,x})\equiv\otimes_{n=1}^{2L+1}\exp(iJ\sigma_{n,x}) \tag{4.16}$$

and

$$J = \int_{\mathbf{R}} dxV(x). \tag{4.17}$$

Consequently, under the conditions (4.15), Eq. (4.12) reduces to the form

$$\Omega_-(t) = P(\phi_t)\otimes Z^\star\hat{\Omega}Z,$$

where ϕ_t is given by Eq. (4.10). On combining this equation with Eq. (4.9), we see that

$$\Omega_\pm(t) = P(\phi_t)\otimes\hat{\Omega}_\pm, \tag{4.18),}$$

where $\hat{\Omega}_\pm$ are the *time-independent* states given by the formulae

$$\hat{\Omega}_+ = \hat{\Omega} \text{ and } \hat{\Omega}_- = Z^\star\hat{\Omega}Z. \tag{4.19}$$

Thus, under the conditions (4.15), the chain $\mathcal{C}$ takes up the steady states $\hat{\Omega}_\pm$ corresponding to the states $u_\pm$ of S. It should be noted that the critical time τ, specified in Eq. (4.15),

is essentially the time required for the particle $\mathcal{P}$ to travel from end to end of the chain $\mathcal{C}$. It is therefore a reasonable macroscopic observational time.

Further, by Eqs. (4.1)-(4.4), (4.16) and (4.19), the explict forms of the states $\hat{\Omega}_\pm$ are given by the equations

$$\hat{\Omega}_+ = 2^{-(2L+1)} \otimes_{n=1}^{2L+1} (I_n + m\sigma_{n,z}) \tag{4.20}$$

and

$$\hat{\Omega}_- = 2^{-(2L+1)} \otimes_{n=1}^{2L+1} \big(I_n + m\sigma_{n,z}\cos(2J) + m\sigma_{n,y}\sin(2J)\big). \tag{4.21}$$

The Macroscopic Phase Cells of $\mathcal{I}$. We take these to be the subspaces $\mathcal{K}_\pm$ of $\mathcal{K}$ corresponding to positive and negative polarizations, respectively, of the chain $\mathcal{C}$ along the Oz-direction. To formulate these subspaces precisely, we first note that the eigenvalues of the total spin of $\mathcal{C}$ along that direction, namely $\Sigma_z := \sum_{n=1}^{(2L+1)} \sigma_z$, are the odd numbers between $-(2L+1)$ and $(2L+1)$. We define $\hat{\mathcal{K}}_+$ (resp. $\hat{\mathcal{K}}_-$) to be the subspace of $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ spanned by the eigenvectors of Σ_z with positive (resp. negative) eigenvalues. Thus, denoting by $\hat{\Psi}$ the simultaneous eigenvector of the $\sigma_{n,z}$'s with eigenvalues all equal to -1, $\hat{\mathcal{K}}_\pm$ are the subspaces of $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ generated by application to $\hat{\Psi}$ of the monomials of order greater than L and less than $(L+1)$, respectively, in the different $\sigma_{n,x}$'s (or $\sigma_{n,y}$'s). We denote their projection operators by $\hat{\Pi}_\pm$, respectively. We then define the phase cells $\mathcal{K}_\pm$ to be the subspaces $\tilde{\mathcal{K}} \otimes \hat{\mathcal{K}}_\pm$ of $\mathcal{K}$, and denote their respective projection operators by $\Pi_\pm$ $(= I_{\tilde{\mathcal{K}}} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_\pm)$.

Evidently, the formulation of the subspaces $\mathcal{K}_\pm$ of $\mathcal{K}$ here corresponds to that of the previous Sections, with α taking the values $+$ and $-$, and fulfills the conditions of Eqs. (2.1) and (2.2). In the treatment that follows, we shall take the correspondence between the phase cells of $\mathcal{I}$ and the eigenstates of S to be the mapping $r \to a(r)$ of Section 3, with $a(\pm) = \pm$. Thus, the phase cells $\mathcal{K}_\pm$ are the indicators for the vector states $u_\pm$, respectively.

Ideality and Normality Conditions for $\mathcal{I}$. It follows now the definition of $\Pi_\pm := I_{\tilde{\mathcal{K}}} \otimes \hat{\Pi}_\pm$ that, on translating the ideality and normality conditions $(3.8)'$ and $(3.14)'$, respectively, into the specifications for this model and using Eqs. (3.1), (3.4) and (3.5), the former condition reduces to the equation

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\hat{\Omega}_+ \hat{\Pi}_-) = \mathrm{Tr}(\hat{\Omega}_- \hat{\Pi}_+) = 0 \tag{4.22))}$$

and the latter to

$$0 < Max\big[\mathrm{Tr}(\hat{\Omega}_+ \hat{\Pi}_-),\ \mathrm{Tr}(\hat{\Omega}_- \hat{\Pi}_+)\big] < \hat{\eta}(L), \tag{4.23}$$

where

$$\hat{\eta}(L) := \eta(2L+1). \tag{4.24}$$

Resultant Properties of $\mathcal{I}$. The following proposition establish that $\mathcal{I}$ is an ideal measuring instrument for certain special values of the parameters of the model S_c and is a normal one for a wide range of those parameters. Further, in the latter case, $\hat{\eta}(L)$ is

exponentially small, i.e. of the order of $\exp(-cL)$, with c a positive constant of the order of unity.

Proposition [20]. *Assuming the conditions of Eq. (4.15), $\mathcal{I}$ has the following properties.*

(a) If $J = \pi/2$ and $m = 1$, then $\mathcal{I}$ is an ideal instrument, with critical time τ. However, although this implies that it satisfies the local stability condition (I.3), it is transformed to a normal instrument by small perturbations of the global polarization m.

(b) If $J\in(\pi/4, \pi/2]$ and $m\in(-1, 0)$, then $\mathcal{I}$ is a normal instrument, again with critical time τ and with $\hat{\eta}(L) = \exp(-cL)$, where c is a numerical constant of the order of unity: specifically $c = -(1/2)\ln(1 - m^2\cos^2(2J))$. Moreover, in this case, the instrument is stable both under small perturbations of the global polarisation, m, and under local modifications of its initial state.

Sketch of Proof. Let $v_{n,\pm}$ denote the eigenstate of $\sigma_{n,z}$ whose eigenvalue is ± 1. Then, by definition of $\hat{\Pi}_+$ (resp. $\hat{\Pi}_-$), the eigenstates of this projector are the tensor products of n v_-'s and $(2L + 1 - n)$ v_+'s (resp. n v_+'s and $(2L + 1 - n)$ v_-'s) with n running from 0 to L. Hence, by Eqs. (4.20) and (4.21),

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\Omega_+\hat{\Pi}_-) = 2^{-(2L+1)}\sum_{n=0}^{L}(1 + m)^n(1 - m)^{2L+1-n}(2L + 1)!/n!(2L + 1 - n)! \quad (4.25)$$

and

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\hat{\Omega}_-\hat{\Pi}_+) =$$

$$2^{-(2L+1)}\sum_{n=0}^{L}(1-(m)\cos(2J))^n(1+(m)\cos(2J))^{2L+1-n}(2L+1)!/n!(2L+1-n)! \quad (4.26)$$

It follows immediately from these equations that, in the case where $m = 1$ and $J = \pi/2$, the r.h.s.'s of these last two equations vanish and thus the ideality condition (4.22) is satisfied. On the other hand, if $J\in(\pi/4, \pi/2]$ and $0 < m < 1$, the summands on the r.h.s's of Eqs. (4.25) and (4.26) are positive for all $n\in[0, L]$, and they take their largest values at $n = L$. A simple application of Sterling's formula to L times the maximum values of these summands then yields the result that the normality condition (4.23) is fulfilled, with $\hat{\eta}(L) = \exp(-cN)$, where $c = -(1/2)\ln(1 - m^2\cos^2(2J))$.

Further, an extension of this analysis establishes that the conditions for both ideal and normal behaviour of $\mathcal{I}$ are stable under strictly localised perturbations of the initial state of the instrument. On the other hand, it is immediately evident that the normality conditions $m\in(0, 1)$, $J\in(\pi/4, \pi/2]$ are stable under small perturbations of the global polarisation m that leave this quantity in the range $(0, 1]$, whereas such perturbations change the ideality conditions $m = 1$, $J = \pi/2$ to those of normality.

5. Concluding Remarks

The realisation of the general scheme of Sections 2 and 3 by the model of Section 4. signifies that the traditional quantum mechanics of finite conservative systems provides

a perfectly adequate framework for the quantum theory of measurement. This theory therefore requires no extraneous elements, such as the interaction of S_c with the 'rest of the Universe' or a nonlinear modification of its Schroedinger dynamics, as has been proposed by some authors [6-10]. Furthermore, the treatment of the model of Section 4 provides a clear illustration of the mathematical dichotomy of ideal and normal measuring instruments. It also establishes that, from an empirical standpoint, there is effectively no distinction between these two classes of instruments, since the odds against the indication by a normal instrument, of a 'wrong' state of a the microsystem are truly astronomical, being of the order of $\exp(cL)$ to one, where c is of the order of unity.

References.

[1] J. Von Neumann: *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 195

[2] A. Peres: Am. J. Phys. **54**, 688 (1986).

[3] N. G. Van Kampen: *Physica* A **153**, 97 (1988).

[4] A. E. Allahverdyan, R. Balian and Th. M. Nieuwenhuizen. Eur. Phys. Lett. **61**, 452 (2003)

[5] E. P.Wigner: Pp. 171-84 of *Symmetries and Reflections*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1967.

[6] N. Gisin: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52**, 1657 (1984).

[7] E. Joos and H. D. Zeh: *Z. Phys.* B **59**, 223 (1985).

[8] L. Diosi: *J. Phys.* A **21**, 2885 (1988).

[9] I. Percival: *Quantum State Diffusion*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1998.

[10] G. C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini and T. Weber: *Phys. Rev.* D **34**, 470 (1986).

[11] N. Bohr: *Discussion with Einstein on epistomological problems in atomic physics*, Pp. 200-241 of *Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist*, Ed. P. A. Schilp, The Library of Living Philosophers, Evanston, IL, 1949.

[12] J, M. Jauch: *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, Addison Wesley, Reading, MA, 1968.

[13] B. Whitten-Wolfe and G. G. Emch: *Helv. Phys. Acta* **49**, 45 (1976).

[14] G. G. Emch: Pp. 255-264 of *Quantum Information and Communication*, E. Donkor, A. R. Pirich and H. E. Brandt, Eds., Intern. Soc. Opt. Eng. (SPIE) Proceedings 5105 (2003).

[15] K.Hepp: *Helv. Phys. Acta* **45**, 237 (1972).

[16] D. Ruelle: *Statistical Mechanics*, W. A. Benjamin, New York, 1969.

[17] G. G. Emch: *Algebraic methods in Statistical Mechanics and Quantum Field Theory*, Wiley, New York, 1972.

[18] G. L. Sewell: *Quantum Mechanics and its Emergent Macrophysics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2002.

[19] J. S. Bell: *Helv. Phys. Acta* **48**, 93 (1975).

[20] G. L. Sewell: *Rep. Math. Phys.* **56**, 271, 2005.

[21] N. G. Van Kampen: *Physica* **20**, 603 (1954).

[22] G. G. Emch: *Helv. Phys. Acta* **37**, 532 (1964).